



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,908	06/24/2003	Peter S. Vosbikian	QUK-2	2166
26689	7590	05/26/2006		
WILDMAN HARROLD ALLEN & DIXON 225 WEST WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 2800 CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER WALCZAK, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			375I	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/602,908		VOSBIKIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	David J. Walczak		3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-68 and 81-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 46, 48-50 and 52-68 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47, 51 and 81-84, 90-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 85-89 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 and 28 February 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendments to the specification filed on 2/28/05 have not been entered since these amendments do not comply with CFR 1.121.

It is noted that this item was brought to the Applicant's attention in the previous office action but was not addressed by the Applicant.

Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure remains objected to because phrases which can be implied, such as "The present invention" should not be present therein. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

It is noted that this objection was made in the previous office action but was not addressed by the Applicant.

Drawings

The drawings remain objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "hook and loop arrangement", "slides" and "screws" (claim 67) must be shown or the features canceled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.

It is noted that this objection was made in the previous office action (with regard to claim 16) but was not addressed by the Applicant.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure remains objected to because of the following informalities: On page 9, line 18, "squeeze member 44" should be --squeeze member 40--, on page 10, line 17, "Support member 22" should be --support member 28--, on page 12, line 25, "FIG. 8" should be --FIG. 9-- and on page 13, line 7, "body 69" should be --body 68--. Appropriate correction is required.

It is noted that these objections were made in the previous office action but were not addressed by the Applicant.

The specification remains objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The recitation of a “cleaning surface” (claim 46) does not have antecedent basis in the specification. Further, the recitation of screws for attaching the cleaning member to the platen (claim 67) does not have antecedent basis in the specification.

It is noted that the objection to the language in claim 67 was made in the previous office action (in regard to claim 16) but was not addressed by the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 47, 49, 51, 82, 84, 108 and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In regard to claims 47, 51, 82 and 111, defining the “cleaning surface” (presumably surface 103) as an absorptive surface/sponge is considered to be new matter. In regard to claim 108, defining the mop head as having an opening to receive the attachments defined in claim 107 is considered to be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 81-84, 90-103 and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalli et al. (hereinafter Lalli) in view of Hirse, Chen and Jilbert. In regard to claims 81 and 92, Lalli discloses a mop comprised of a handle 12 for holding a fluid, a mop head having a cleaning member 137 and one or more openings (in spray head 110) in communication with the handle for releasing fluid. Although the handle is not structured as claimed, attention is directed to the Jilbert reference, which discloses another dispensing mop wherein the handle holds fluid but does not employ a removable container and includes an opening on the surface of the upper end thereof (covered by cap 11) for pouring fluid into the handle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the Lalli device such that the inner container is not needed in order to enable a user to more easily fill the handle and reduce the overall number of parts needed to make the device. Although the mop head in the Lalli device does not include the claimed structure, attention is directed to the Hirse reference, which discloses an analogous mop wherein the cleaning member is compressed between two rollers wherein the mop is a butterfly mop comprises of opposing plates 5 (defining a hinged platen) structured as claimed in order to enable the cleaning member to be wrung. Accordingly, it is the Examiner's

position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the cleaning member currently used on the Lalli device with a butterfly type cleaning member wherein such a modification would amount to the mere substitution of one functionally equivalent cleaning member for another and the selection of either cleaning member would work equally well on the Lalli device.

Although the Lalli device does not include an additional cleaning surface located on a plane differing from the cleaning member, attention is directed to the Chen reference, which discloses another mop wherein an additional cleaning surface 34 disposed on a plane different than the plane of the cleaning member 29 is employed in order to enable a user to have access to an additional cleaning surface. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add such a cleaning surface onto the Lalli device in order to enable a user to have access to an additional cleaning surface. In regard to claim 82 and 111, the cleaning surface 34 of Chen is an abrasive surface. In regard to claim 83, the additional cleaning surface 34 of Chen is attached via a separate part. Accordingly, it would be obvious to attach the additional cleaning surface to the Lalli device via a separate part. In regard to claim 84, the abrasive surface is a brush. In regard to claims 90 and 101, Hirse discloses an actuator for compressing the cleaning member and the cleaning member is "releasably secured" to the mop head. In regard to claims 91 and 93, only one valve 70 is employed by Lalli to release cleaning fluid. In regard to claim 94, the valve includes a O-ring 51. In regard to claim 95, the valve includes a hollow valve body (with an aperture 71) including an annular shoulder 61. In regard to claim 96, the valve body

Art Unit: 3751

includes one or more apertures 71. In regard to claim 97, a sleeve 55 is positioned over the hollow body. In regard to claim 98, a barbed fitting is in communication with the valve assembly (see column 4, lines 60-61). In regard to claim 99, a flexible tube 90 is in communication with the opening. In regard to claim 100, an actuator 95 opens the valve assembly to release the fluid. In regard to claim 102, the handle has a substantially uniform cross-section. In regard to claim 103, the additional cleaning surface could obviously be mounted substantially perpendicular to the platen.

Claim 104 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalli in view of Hirse, Chen and Jilbert as applied to claim 81 above, and further in view of Jones. Although the Lalli device does not include a window thereon, attention is directed to the Jones reference, which discloses another mop having cleaning solution in the handle wherein a window 4 is positioned on the handle in order to enable a user to view the contents therein. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include such a window on the Lalli device in order to enable a user to view the contents therein.

Claims 105-107, 109 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalli in view of Hirse, Chen and Jilbert as applied to claim 81 above, and further in view of George. In regard to claims 105-107, although the Lalli device does not include a disposable cleaning member over the cleaning member, attention is directed to the George device, which discloses another mop, wherein disposable cleaning members 22 are positioned by clips over the cleaning member in order to enable a user to remove a cleaning member when it becomes dirty and have easy

access to a new, clean cleaning member. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include such removable, disposable cleaning members onto the Lalli device in order to enable a user to have ready access to clean cleaning members. In regard to claim 109, the mop can be used with the disposable cleaning members. In regard to claim 110, the cleaning members 22 are considered to be reusable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 46, 48, 50 and 52-68 are allowed.

Claims 85-89 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Walczak whose telephone number is 571-272-4895. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 6:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on 571-272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



David J. Walczak
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

DJW
5/22/06